

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1871

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)


CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO –189)

On October 16, 2007, the Panel transferred 2 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See* 528 F.Supp.2d 1339 (J.P.M.L. 2007). Since that time, 2,128 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M Rufe.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and assigned to Judge Rufe.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the reasons stated in the order of October 16, 2007, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M Rufe.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7–day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.



FOR THE PANEL:



Jeffery N. Lüthi
Clerk of the Panel

**IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES
PRACTICES AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1871

SCHEDULE CTO-189 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	<u>CASE CAPTION</u>
ARIZONA			
AZ	2	15-00679	Mayfield Family v. GlaskoSmithKline Opposed 4/24/15
NEVADA			
NV	2	15-00682	Haley v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation